DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 681 CS 003 036

AUTHOR Stephens, Charles E., Comp.; Hesse, Rose, Comp.
TITLE Description of the Elementary Reading Program. District Summary Report.
INSTITUTION Eugene School District 4J, Oreg.
PUB DATE Mar 76
NOTE 20p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; *Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Instruction; Reading Materials; *Reading Programs; School Districts
IDENTIFIERS Eugene Oregon School District; Oregon (Eugene)

ABSTRACT

This summary of the Eugene, Oregon, district elementary schools' reports on their reading programs includes information on materials, articulation, organization, personnel, evaluation, volunteers, and time. (JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED133681

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EUGENE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School District 4J, Lane County

DESCRIPTION OF THE ELEMENTARY READING PROGRAM
DISTRICT SUMMARY REPORT

March 24, 1976

2

Compiled by: Charles E. Stephens
Research Design Specialist
Rose Hesse, Intern

CS003036

I N D E X

Introduction i

Procedures ii

Materials iii

Organization 3

Articulation 4

Time 4

Personnel 5

Volunteers 6

Evaluation 8

Unmet Needs 9

Description of the Elementary Reading Program
District Summary Report

Introduction

This report is in response to the request from the Board of Directors at their October 6, 1975, meeting:

> That each building file a detailed plan of the reading program with the appropriate Regional Director. This plan would include statements of (a) the building efforts in the teaching of reading (including materials, articulation, organization, personnel, and utilization of other resources), (b) unmet needs, and (c) ways of resolving the unmet needs.

This request was implemented by the Research Design Specialist and three of the four Curriculum Specialists jointly, developing a data collection form for use across the district. The resultant form was approved by the Superintendent's Staff at their regular meeting on November 5, 1975. Copies of the form with cover letter from the Superintendent were provided to each Regional Director for distribution in their respective regions. Each principal was asked to provide the information to their Director by January 15, 1976. After the building level reports were returned to the Directors, this office prepared photo copies of the reports for the purpose of summarization. Procedures used in preparing this summary are given in detail in the procedures section. After the summary had been prepared it was given to the Regional Directors for final review. This report utilized the results of the Directors' review.

Procedures used in compiling data:

Materials: Materials listed by all schools were compiled into a master list. The frequency of use of each item mentioned was then recorded. Any material mentioned more than three times within a given region was reported on the summary list. The summary list is in rank order, from the most frequently reported to the least frequently reported.

Organization: Data from the schools was grouped into three categories: a) organizational plan, b) major criteria for placing in groups, and c) diagnostic techniques used. The organizational plans listed by all the schools were compiled into a master list. The frequency of use of each organizational plan was then recorded per region. Any organizational plan which was mentioned more than three times within a region appears on the summary list. The summary list is in rank order from the most frequently reported to the least frequently reported.

This same procedure was used to compile the data for the major criteria for placing children in groups, and was the data for the diagnostic techniques used. The same criteria were applied and the same method of reporting used.

Articulation: Since it appears that this question was understood differently by the responding schools, these data were not summarized. A statement to this effect was included in the summary report.

Time: Data from the schools are grouped into two categories: a) time spent in direct instruction, and b) time spent in indirect instruction. The times as reported by the schools were recorded within intervals of one (0-1, 1 1/2-2, 2 1/2-3, etc.). Since schools frequently reported different time spent for different grade levels, this information was recorded by grade levels and then totaled, by region, into a frequency distribution. The means, medians, and modes of the frequency distributions were reported in the summary report.

Personnel: The responses from the schools were on a matrix which portrayed eight positions (classroom teacher, etc.) and four areas of responsibility. The areas of responsibility were: a) overall coordination, b) developmental, c) remedial, and d) enrichment. The frequency reported was recorded within the matrix for each region. In the summary report, a region was listed if three or more schools had listed persons taking responsibility in the area.

Volunteers: Data from the schools are grouped into three categories: a) in-building students, b) parent volunteers, and c) other volunteers. The number

of volunteers as reported by the schools was recorded in intervals of five (0-5, 6-10, etc.).

This information was then totaled and rendered into a percentage of schools within the region which reported volunteers within that particular interval. This information is reported in the summary report.

Evaluation: Data from the schools were reported by whether or not the school utilized the following evaluation methods: a) scope and sequence tests, b) basal mastery tests, c) standardized norm-referenced tests, d) teacher judgment, 3) principal judgment, or f) other techniques. The schools were asked to list criteria used when use of teacher or principal judgment was reported. The frequency of response was recorded per region. This was then rendered into a percentage of schools reporting use of each method per region. These data appear in the summary report. The criteria used in teacher and principal judgment were listed and the frequency of mention of each criteria was then reported. On the summary report any criterion which was mentioned more than four times was included.

Needs: The expressed needs, data sources cited to support needs, and suggestions for resolution were listed in table format for each region with responses entered exactly as received. These data were then summarized into three major trends on the basis that each region reflected them and they were the most frequently mentioned needs.

SUMMARY OF THE ELEMENTARY READING PROGRAM

Question 1: Materials

Please list the MAJOR material used

a. Sequential or basal textbook series
b. Supplemental textbook series
c. Examples of materials used for individualized instruction (re Glass Analysis, DISTAR, etc.)
d. Other major supplementary materials

Summary:

a. Basal Texts

The most commonly used basal text series used in grades K-3 were:

Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
Ginn 360 Houghton Mifflin	Ginn 360 Houghton Mifflin	Ginn 360 Houghton Mifflin	Ginn 360 Houghton Mifflin Lippincott Ginn Swirl

The most commonly used basal text series used in grades 4-6 were:

Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
Ginn 360 Houghton Mifflin	Ginn 360 Houghton Mifflin Harper Row Holt, Rinehart, Winston Scott Foresman MacMillan	Ginn 360 Houghton Mifflin	Ginn 360 Hoghton Mifflin

b. Supplemental Materials

The most commonly used supplemental materials in grades K-3 were:

Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
Ginn 360 Harper Row Scott Foresman Houghton Mifflin Allyn Bacon	Houghton Mifflin Reader's Digest Barnell Loft SRA kit	SRA kit MacMillan Harper Row	Merrill SRA kit Houghton Mifflin Ginn 360 Lippincott Benziger

The most commonly used supplemental materials in grades 4-6 were:

Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
Holt, Rinehart, Winston Houghton Mifflin Scott Foresman	Houghton Mifflin	Holt, Rinehart, Winston Ginn 360	Ginn 360

The most common organizational plans for grades 4-6 were:

Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
small groups back-to-back reading with P.E. individualized instruction reading specialist	ability or interest groups individualized instruction	small groups individualized instruction	self-contained classrooms small groups back-to-back reading with P.E. individualized instruction

b. Criteria for placing children in groups

The most common criteria used for placing children in groups in grades K-3 were:

Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
teacher judgment diagnostic tests IRI's	performance on Gates-MacGinitie teacher judgment	teacher judgment testing diagnostic tests	teacher judgment IRI's oral reading achievement

The most common criteria for placing children in groups in grades 4-6 were:

Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
teacher judgment diagnostic tests child interest	ability teacher judgment	IRI's testing teacher judgment performance on Gates-Macginitie	diagnostic tests IRI's teacher judgment achievement

c. Diagnostic techniques

The most common diagnostic techniques used in grades K-3 were:

Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
District scope and sequence tests teacher-made tests IRI's	District scope & sequence tests teacher judgment diagnostic prescriptive inventory	District scope and sequence tests teacher judgment Gates-MacGinitie	Dignostic-prescriptive inventory District scope and sequence tests IRI's basal mastery tests

The most common diagnostic techniques used in grades 4-6 were:

Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
District scope & sequence tests IRI's basal mastery tests	District scope & sequence tests IRI's teacher judgment diagnostic-prescriptive inventory	District scope & sequence tests	Diagnostic-prescriptive inventory District scope and sequence tests basal mastery tests group word analysis

c. Materials used for Individualized Instruction

The most commonly used materials for individualized instruction in grades K-3 were:

Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
Distar	Distar	SRA Kit	Distar
SRA kit	Glass Word Analysis	Glass Word Analysis	Glass Word Analysis
Glass Word Analysis	SRA Kit	Distar	SRA Kit
Merrill		Diagnostic Prescriptive Program	Merrill
			Diagnostic Prescriptive Program
			Barnell Loft

The most commonly used materials for individualized instruction in grades 4-6 were:

Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
Glass Word Analysis	Barnell Loft	Glass Word Analysis	Glass Word Analysis
Library books	Reader's Digest	Barnell Loft	Distar
SRA kits	Glass Word Analysis	McCall Crabb	Barnell Loft
Reader's Digest			Diagnostic Prescriptive Program
McGraw Hill			SRA Kits

Question 2: Organization

a. Please list the organizational plans used for reading instruction.
b. What are the major criteria used to place children in groups for instruction?
c. Indicate the diagnostic techniques that are used.
   1. District scope and sequence tests
   2. Probe sheets
   3. Others

Summary:

a. Organizational Plans

The most common organizational plans for grades K-3 were:

Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
individualized instruction	individualized instruction	small groups	self-contained classrooms
small groups	back-to-back reading with P.E.	individualized instruction	small groups
back-to-back reading with P.E.	ability or interest groups	back-to-back reading with P.E.	back-to-back reading with P.E.
ability or interest groups			individualized instruction

Question 3: Articulation (within grade level and across grade levels) How is the program(s) articulated for:

a. Skills
b. Materials (resources)
c. Are individual record forms used for:
   1. skills
   2. materials covered

Summary

The question asking for the methods used in the articulation of skills and materials was apparently understood differently by the responding schools. It was very difficult, if not impossible, to interpret the responses to this question as a result. The responses will be made available to regional directors for their feedback, in the regional reports.

Question 4: Time

a. What is the average time (in hours per week) spent on direct instruction?
b. What is the average time (in hours per week) spent on indirect instruction (free reading)?

Summary

a. Time spent in direct instruction

The time spent in direct instruction in grades K-3 is presented by mean*, median*, and mode* for each region. Time is given in hours per week of instruction.

	Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
Mean	7½ - 8	6½ - 7	7½ - 8	5½ - 6
Median	6½ - 7	4½ - 5	7½ - 8	4½ - 5
Mode	7½ - 8 10½ - 11	4½ - 5	7½ - 8	4½ - 5

The time spent in direct instruction in grades 4-6 is presented by mean*, median*, and mode* for each region. Time is given in hours of instruction per week.

	Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
Mean	4½ - 5	5½ - 6	4½ - 5	5½ - 6
Median	4½ - 5	4½ - 5	4½ - 5	4½ - 5
Mode	4½ - 5	4½ - 5	4½ - 5	4½ - 5

b. Time spent in indirect instruction

The time spent in indirect instruction in grades K-3 is presented by mean*, median*, and mode* for each region. Time is given in

hours of instruction per week.

	Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
Mean	2½ - 3	4½ - 5	4½ - 5	3½ - 4
Median	2½ - 3	1½ - 2	2½ - 3	2½ - 3
Mode	2½ - 3	1½ - 2	1½ - 2	2½ - 3

The time spent in indirect instruction in grades 4-6 is presented by mean*, median*, and mode* for each region. Time is given in hours of instruction per week.

	Churchill Region	North Region	Sheldon Region	South Region
Mean	3½ - 4	3½ - 4	2½ - 3	3½ - 4
Median	4½ - 5	1½ - 2	2½ - 3	2½ - 3
Mode	3½ - 4	1½ -2	2½ - 3	1½ - 2

*The mean represents the average number of hours of instruction which were reported. The median represents the mid-point within the entire range of reported hours of instruction. The mode represents the most frequently reported number of hours of instruction

Question 5: Personnel

Please check the major responsibilities each of the positions listed have for the reading program. The format for responding to this question was a matrix listing eight types of positions and four areas of responsibilities. The column and row headings were the same as shown in the summary.

Summary

POSITION	MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES			
	Overall Coordination	Developmental	Remedial	Enrichment
Classroom teacher	Churchill North Sheldon South	Churchill North Sheldon South	Churchill North Sheldon South	Churchill North Sheldon South
Reading Specialist	Churchill North Sheldon South	Churchill North South	Churchill North Sheldon South	Churchill North Sheldon South
Aide		Churchill North South	Churchill North Sheldon South	North
Principal	Churchill North Sheldon South			

Summary (cont.)

POSITION	MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES			
	Overall Coordination	Developmental	Remedial	Enrichment
Inbuilding Student Tutor		Churchill	Churchill North Sheldon South	North
Parent Volunteer Tutors		Churchill North South	Churchill North Sheldon South	Churchill North South
Other Volunteer Tutors		Churchill South	Churchill North Sheldon South	North South
Others (such as counselors, librarians, media specialists, student teachers)	South	Churchill North South	South	Churchill North Sheldon South

Question 6: Volunteers (used in reading program)

In grades K-3 the percent of schools per region reporting the use of in-building students was:

a. In-building students--average number used per month
b. Parent volunteers--average number used per month
c. Other volunteers--average number used per month

Summary

a. In-building student

In grades K-3 the percent of schools per region reporting the use of in-building students was:

Number of Volunteers Per Month

Region	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	over 25
Churchill	38%	13%	0	38%	13%	0
North	14%	14%	0	14%	0	57%
Sheldon	0	0	17%	33%	0	33%
South	36%	21%	7%	0	7%	14%

In grades 4-6 the percent of schools per region reporting the use of in-building students was:

Region	Number of Volunteers Per Month					
	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	over 25
Churchill	0	13%	0	13%	25%	13%
North	14%	0	0	14%	0	43%
Sheldon	0	0	50%	17%	0	0
South	21%	29%	7%	0	7%	14%

b. Parent Volunteers

In grades K-3 the percent of schools per region reporting the use of parent volunteers was:

Region	Number of Volunteers Per Month					
	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	over 25
Churchill	13%	0	38%	13%	13%	0
North	14%	43%	0	0	0	43%
Sheldon	0	33%	17%	17%	0	0
South	50%	14%	7%	0	0	7%

In grades 4-6 the percent of schools per region reporting the use of parent volunteers was:

Region	Number of Volunteers Per Month					
	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	over 25
Churchill	38%	25%	0	0	13%	0
North	57%	14%	0	0	0	29%
Sheldon	33%	33%	0	0	0	0
South	57%	14%	0	0	0	7%

c. Other Volunteers

In grades K-3 the percent of schools per region reporting the use of other volunteers was:

Region	Number of Volunteers Per Month					
	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	over 25
Churchill	25%	13%	0	38%	13%	0
North	57%	14%	14%	0	0	14%
Sheldon	50%	0	17%	0	0	0
South	57%	14%	14%	7%	0	7%

In grades 4-6 the percent of schools per region reporting the use of other volunteers was:

	Number of Volunteers Per Month					
Region	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	over 25
Churchill	38%	13%	0	0	0	0
North	29%	0	0	0	0	29%
Sheldon	33%	0	0	0	0	0
South	50%	14%	14%	0	0	7%

Question 7: Evaluation

Please list the methods used (during the 1975-76 school year) for evaluating the reading program.

a. scope and sequence tests
b. basal mastery tests
c. standardized norm referenced tests
d. teacher judgment
   1. What criteria were used for teacher judgment?
e. Principal judgment
   1. What criteria were used for principal judgment?
f. other

Summary

In grades K-3 the evaluation methods used were:

Evaluation Method	Churchill	North	Sheldon	South
Scope and sequence tests	88%	100%	83%	69%
Basal mastery tests	38%	88%	67%	77%
Standardized norm-referenced tests	88%	100%	67%	85%
Teacher judgment*	100%	100%	83%	100%
Principal judgment**	88%	75%	50%	77%
Other	13%	38%	0	31%

In grades 4-6 the evaluation methods used were:

Evaluation Method	Churchill	North	Sheldon	South
Scope and sequence tests	75%	38%	17%	69%
Basal mastery tests	50%	50%	67%	77%
Standardized norm-referenced tests	100%	63%	83%	85%
Teacher judgment*	88%	75%	83%	92%
Principal judgment**	88%	50%	50%	77%
Other	13%	25%	0	38%

* The most common criteria used were oral reading, teacher-made tests, and comprehension and study skills.

** The most common criteria used were standardized test results, classroom observations, and teacher feedback

Question 8: Based on your evaluative data, diagnostic data, and the district's Goals and Objectives for reading, what are the major unmet needs for each level (K-3 and 4-6)?

Question 9: What are your suggestions for meeting the identified needs?

Summary

For purposes of summation the data provided by questions 8 and 9 are reported together.

The responses to the question on unmet needs drew a wide variety of responses, many unique to the individual school. However, over the district three very general concerns emerged. a) A very broad and general need which was expressed in many different ways was that insufficient time was available to teach reading. This was reflected in requests for smaller class sizes, more teachers, more aides, more reading specialists and expanded volunteer programs. b) The second general trend was the need for materials which are more appropriate. This was reflected in requests for use of a consistent program (basal or otherwise), concern of materials not arriving by the beginning of the school year, and varying needs for special materials for special needs (supplemental, individualized, etc.). c) A third need seemed to be a lack of emphasis on programs for the high achieving or gifted reader. A major solution suggested was to provide more individualized programs along with related requests for financial help to purchase teaching time and materials.

Details on the unmet need of each building are contained in the more extensive regional report.

SCHOOL DISTRICT 4J EUGENE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

200 North Monroe Eugene, Oregon 97402

DIVISION OF RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

December 1, 1976

MEMORANDUM

TO: Superintendent

FROM: Reading Evaluation Committee

RE: Phase 1 Report of the Reading Evaluation Committee

The purpose of this report is to inform you of the work done during Phase One of the reading evaluation and the work to be done in the remaining phases of evaluation of elementary reading programs.

Chronology of events leading to present report

On July 14, 1975, the Superintendent asked the Research, Development and Evaluation Department (RD&E) to report on plans for the assessment of the reading program. The report was drafted by the Research Department on July 28, 1975, shared with regional directors on August 4, 1975, and presented to the Superintendent on October 6, 1975.

This report recommended that a compendium of reading programs used in schools be developed. It also recommended that each school file a detailed plan of the reading program with the appropriate regional director and that each school staff review curriculum goals and objectives and determine if a discrepancy exists between what should be and what is being taught.

The report was presented to the Board of Directors on October 6, 1975. Board members requested that three pieces of information be collected: (1) data on reading instruction, (2) unmet needs in reading, and (3) suggestions for resolving these unmet needs. The Board also requested on October 6, 1975, that a comprehensive plan for assessing reading be developed. This request for information resulted in a report in February, published March 24, 1976, in final form, called Description of the Elementary Reading Program, District Summary.

CS003036

On April 14, 1976, the Superintendent's staff discussed the report and agreed that (1) the primary focus of an evaluation should be on elementary schools, and (2) that principals should be responsible for producing an accurate description of their school's reading program.

On May 17, 1976, the Board received the preliminary Reading Evaluation Plan. On June 28, 1976, RD&E held a work session with the Board to inform it of evaluation techniques, reading programs and the phases of the proposed evaluation of the district's reading programs.

On July 21, 1976, the Superintendent informed the staff that the Reading Evaluation Team from RD&E--the evaluation specialist, the planning specialist, the research design specialist, the special projects assistant, the assistant superintendent for RD&E and a data collector--would serve as staff to the Reading Evaluation Committee. The committee would represent reading teachers, the district reading specialists, the University, parents, and principals. On August 30, 1976, the committee was appointed by the Superintendent. On September 10, 1976, the Superintendent informed district staff that "The Board has directed that a comprehensive study and evaluation of the district's reading programs be undertaken." The first meeting of the Reading Evaluation Committee was on September 15, 1976.

Composition of Reading Evaluation Committee and Reading Evaluation Team

The Reading Evaluation Committee consists of seven people: Mike Brott, Chairperson, principal at Willagillespie Elementary School; Terry Bullock, College of Education faculty at the University of Oregon; Margaret Nichols, director of Educational Services; Lila Padgett, reading specialist at McCornack Elementary School; Martha Robert, an elementary teacher at Santa Clara Elementary School; Marge Smith, parent; and Barb West, member of the school board. Leslie Hendrickson of RD&E is an ex-officio member of the committee. This committee is an advisory committee to the Reading Evaluation Team and the committee reports to the Superintendent.

The Reading Evaluation Team consists of four people: Larry Barber, Assistant Superintendent for Research, Development and Evaluation; Susan Franklin, planning specialist; Leslie Hendrickson, evaluation specialist; and Charles Stephens, research specialist.

The four RD&E team members have been assigned regions. Each person will be responsible for the conduct of the evaluation in his/her region and is expected to be familiar with the reading programs of the region. The assignments are: Larry Barber for the North Region; Susan Franklin and a data collector for the South Region; Leslie Hendrickson for the Churchill Region; and Charles Stephens for the Sheldon Region.

Any parent, student or staff person who wishes to ask questions or make statements about the reading evaluation should contact the appropriate RD&E staff person or the Reading Evaluation Committee members. RD&E staff will be happy to meet with school staff or parent advisory councils to explain the evaluation.

Purpose of the evaluation

On October 19, 1976, the Reading Evaluation Committee decided that the purpose of the evaluation was threefold, and RD&E was requested to determine: (1) Are the district elementary reading programs effective according to the district's Reading Scope and Sequence? (2) What makes effective programs effective? (3) If programs are not effective, what are those things that could be done to make them effective?

Phases of the evaluation

The Reading Evaluation Team has designed a four-phase evaluation.

1. The first phase is a period during which existing descriptive information on reading programs is identified and the preliminary evaluation is done. This phase is almost completed.

Four sources of descriptive information exist. The first is the results of a questionnaire submitted by principals during the 1975-76 school year. A summary of questionnaire responses was presented to the Board on March 24, 1976, and a more detailed description of the questionnaire results is attached to this report as Appendix A. Second, the district's Reading Scope and Sequence describes minimum expectations that students of different grades should be able to accomplish. Third, RD&E has testing data on reading comprehension and vocabulary. Fourth, the Profile of Schools contains useful background data on community schools and student characteristics.

Preliminary evaluation planning is complete. Three major tasks were completed as part of this planning. First, a survey of 65 large school districts in eleven western states and eleven state departments of education were contacted. RD&E found one school district which had carried out an evaluation similar to our planned evaluation and a copy of it was obtained.

Second, a review of literature published since 1960 was made to find articles or books reporting on actual reading evaluations carried out by local school districts. A hand search of the 5,300 titles in the 1960-68 Education Index listed 82 references relevant to the evaluation of

reading programs. An ERIC computer search of published literature since 1968 listed 49 references to reading programs. All published references were read. No articles or books describing actual evaluations were found.

Third, the Committee considered approximately 100 possible topics that could be studied during a reading evaluation. Thirty-four topics were chosen and planning was begun on studying two of those topics in Phase Two.

Based on recommendations from principals, the Reading Evaluation Team has decided that data will also be reported on the Eastside, Magnet Arts, and Traditional Alternative School programs. The Patterson, Evergreen, and Corridor school programs will not be studied separately.

2. Phase Two is a period in which resources used on reading programs will be identified and measured. Five separate studies will be carried out as part of Phase Two.

First, a study shall be made to identify the amounts for those budget accounts that are used by a school to support the school's reading program. Second, all elementary principals shall be mailed a questionnaire asking them how much money they receive for instructional support, how the money is allocated and how much of the money spent can be traced to support of the reading program.

Third, all elementary teachers shall be sent a questionnaire asking what kind of materials they use to teach reading, approximately how much of each kind do they use, and how effective is this material, in their opinion. Fourth, a random sample of elementary classrooms for three to four periods to measure the amount of time students spend studying reading. Fifth, district administrators will be asked to identify existing school board or administrative policy which states what priority the district's reading program should have.

Phase Two will last two and one-half months and should be completed by January 31, 1977.

3. Phase Three is a period in which school staff will be asked about severe reading problems, the school's organization of reading, staff agreements, about the school's reading program, the school's testing program, the school's record-keeping system and the use of a sequence of skill development. This phase will last approximately two months and should be completed by March 31, 1977.

4. Phase Four is a period in which the effectiveness of reading programs will be studied. It will include four tasks. First, student scores on tests of comprehension, vocabulary, oral and silent reading, word analysis and study skills will be studied. Second, other consequences of the program's operation will be studied. Third, an estimation shall be made as to what kind of reading programs appear to work and why. Fourth, recommendations will be presented to help improve the district's reading programs.

A separate report shall be prepared describing the results of each phase and be presented to the Board when the phase is finished.

A final report showing data for each school and the three alternative school programs will be reported on in the fall of 1977.

LH:jd